Dear Jim, re Mark Lane's "Plausible Denial,"

9/28/91

The Publishers Weekly 9/6 issue review is still another illustration of the fact that if reviewers are impressed by an author's allegeed credentials they go for the most transparently nonsensical crap.

And crap is vintage Lane, from when he was left to now that he can't get much farthur to the right. I'm grateful that he is there, too!

I remember a little about that suit, in Miami. The question was of libel, not the CIA's JFK assassination involvement. Lane started giving it this twist merely because he argued it, and having argued it, he immediately proclaimed that the jury had agreed. Not so. The jury held that what Victor Marchetti had written was not libellous under controlling decisions. It had no need to consider what Lane alleged and it did not, not from the news accounts I read at the time.

I have never seen any corroboration of Marita Lorenz's allegation that shr worked for the CIA when she says she slept with Castro. Nor for that matter anything supporting her self-proclaimed sleeping habits.

What the review says about that alleged trip to Dallas also was well-punlicized when she said it, in the supermarket tabloids. I've seen nothing to even suggest corrobotation and I believe it was her, or Frank Sturgis' or their combined story of having driven to Dallas the day before the assassination with a carload of guns. She and Sturgis were the sturdiest and most prolific of fictioneers and on that basis alone the story has no credibility.(She had others stories, as Sturgis also did.)

Moreover, it could not possibly have been any intelligence operation if she did not make it all up because it violates all known tradecraft. No spookery would be that open with that many people witting. In saying this I assume she did not say that those in the car with her, Hunt, Sturgis, etc., were the assassina. But unless they were, what in the hell were they doing with the guns? Do assassins need porters?

You can be sure that if with his long life of spooking Hunt had been in any way involved he would have been sure there were no witnesses.and he'd not have been anywhere near the scene. all of which Lane knows.

I have had no mail on this, have seen no other reviews and nobdoy has mentioned it or asked me about it. If you see any other reviews or comments I'd appreciate copies for the record.

I suppose that by now the CIA has been asked about it and declined commet, its usual practise.If so they missed a bet! They could have torn Lane et al up and in the course of so doing made themselves look good.

Thanks and best,

Harold